arXiv:quant-ph/0506152v4 23 May 2006

Range criterion and classification of true entanglement in $2 \times M \times N$ system

Lin Chen and Yi-Xin Chen
Zhejiang Insitute of Modern Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, People's Republic of China

We propose a range criterion which is a sufficient and necessary condition satisfied by two pure states transformable with each other under reversible stochastic local operations assisted with classical communication. We also provide a systematic method for seeking all kinds of true entangled states in the $2 \times M \times N$ system, and can effectively distinguish them by means of the range criterion. The efficiency of the criterion and the method is exhibited by the classification of true entanglement in some types of the tripartite systems.

One of the main tasks in quantum information theory (QIT) is to find out how many different ways there exist, in which several spatially distributed objects could be entangled under certain prior constraints of physical resource. Such a restriction is the transformation of entangled states by local operations assisted with classical communication (LOCC). All bipartite pure entangled states are interconvertible in the asymptotic LOCC transformations [1]. This implies that all bipartite pure entangled states can be used to perform the same task of entanglement processing in the asymptotic regime. However, for single copies of states, any two pure states in the same class under LOCC can be convertible with certainty from each other by local unitary operation [2, 3].

In the general bipartite system, infinitely many entangled states are not related by local unitary operations and continuous parameters are used to characterize all equivalent classes corresponding to them [4, 5]. In order to classify them more succinctly, an alternative restriction was introduced [3, 6]. This restriction requires that the conversion of the states is through stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC), i.e. through LOCC but without imposing that it has to be achieved with certainty. Two pure states of a multipartite system are equivalent under SLOCC if and only if (iff) they are related by an invertible local operator (ILO) [6]. Comparing with the other constraints, SLOCC is coarser, but more practical and simpler for the classification of entanglement. For instance, the state $|00\rangle$ and the Bell state, $|\Phi\rangle = |00\rangle + |11\rangle$ are under this criterion the only two classes in two-qubit systems.

Such restriction becomes stricter in multipartite settings, since multiparty entanglement has a much more complicated configuration than the bipartite case. For the true tripartite entangled states, there exist not only the three-qubit GHZ state [7] and but also the so-called three-qubit W state [6], which was shown to be essentially different from the GHZ state under SLOCC. In principle, the conclusion of the SLOCC equivalence under ILO's [6] is sufficient to classify the entanglement properties of single copies of states. However, for the classification of entangled states of general multipartite system, the classification based on this conclusion becomes more and more complicated with increasing of dimensions of Hilbert space of such system and the exponential increase of number of parameters when classifying multiparty entanglement [8, 9, 10]. In fact, it is almost impossible to make use of it to perform the classification and the construction of the different entangled states in general multipartite system. So we need to establish a more effective criterion involved in the subspaces of the Hilbert space.

In this paper, we introduce a more straightforward and effective criterion of the equivalent classes of entanglements under SLOCC in general multipartite system, where only a single copy of state is available. Different from the definition of equivalence classes of entangled states suggested by Dür *et al* [6], our criterion is constructive for the entangled states of multipartite system. Indeed, based on the criterion, an iterated method can be introduced to determine all classes of true entangled states in the $2 \times M \times N$ system. Combined such method with the criterion, we not only can classify the entangled states but also can construct them.

In order to arrive at our criterion in a smooth way, we ought to introduce some necessary notations and useful concepts in this paper. Since we are concerned with the entanglement properties of the states of many parties, we should understand the quantum properties of the states of each party. Such quantum state can be described by the reduced density matrix of single party from the composite state of many parties. The rank of it is called as the local rank. Since we are interested with the classification of pure entangled states in the multipartite system, the state $\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ can be realized by the expression $\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N} = |\Psi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}\langle\Psi|$. In the notation, we shall use $\rho^B_{\Psi_{AB}}$ to stand for the reduced density operator of B system from the state $|\Psi\rangle_{AB}$. The local ranks of any pure state are invariant under SLOCC [6]. Hence, one can use the local ranks of the parties to characterize the Hilbert space of multipartite system, e.g., the $D_1 \times D_2 \times \cdots \times D_N$ space, where D_i is the local rank of the party A_i. Due to the invariance of the local ranks under SLOCC and the Schmidt decomposition with respect to the party A_j and the other party $A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N$, any state $|\Psi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ (sometimes also written $|\Psi\rangle_{D_1D_2\cdots D_N}$) in the $D_1 \times D_2 \times \cdots \times D_N$ space can always be transformed into the following form,

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{D_j-1} |i\rangle_{A_j} \otimes |i\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N}, \qquad (1)$$

where $\langle i|k\rangle_{A_j} = \delta_{ik}$ and $\{|i\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N}, i = 0, 1, \cdots, D_j - 1\}$ are a set of linearly independent vectors. We call the above expression *adjoint form* and the vector $|i\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N}$ *adjoint state*. Here the set $\{|i\rangle_{A_j}\}$ are chosen as the computational basis.

The concept of range of quantum state plays an essential role in our criterion. Let state ρ act on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. In the standard manner, the range of ρ is defined by $R(\rho) = |\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} : \rho|\Phi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$, for some $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. For the *adjoint* reduced density matrix $\rho^{A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N}_{\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}}$ of the party A_j, one can clearly see that all states $|\Theta\rangle$, which are from $|\Theta\rangle = \rho^{A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N}_{\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}}|\Gamma\rangle$ for any $|\Gamma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{j-1}A_{j+1}\cdots A_N}$, span the whole range of it. In fact, for a general multipartite system, the local rank of each party and the range of the adjoint reduced density matrix of it determine completely the character property of a pure multiple entangled state under SLOCC. The following theorem exhibits such relation.

Theorem 1: Range Criterion. Two pure states of a multipartite system are equivalent under SLOCC iff (i) they have the same local rank of each party, and (ii) the ranges of the adjoint reduced density matrices of each party of them are related by certain ILO's.

Now, let us use $|\Psi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ and $|\Phi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ to denote such two states, and V_i to do the ILO acting on the party A_i. The theorem 1 can be formulated that $|\Psi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N} = V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_N|\Phi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ iff they have the same local rank, $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ and $S_2 \subseteq S_1$, i.e. $S_1 = S_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\equiv \{|\phi\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}, |\phi\rangle \in R(\rho^{A_2\cdots A_N}_{\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}})\}, \qquad (2)\\ S_2 &\equiv \{|\phi\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}, |\phi\rangle \in V_2 \otimes ... \otimes V_N R(\rho^{A_2\cdots A_N}_{\Phi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Necessity. If the two states are equivalent under SLOCC, they must have the same local rank. By means of the expression of $|\Phi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ in the adjoint form, we get $R(\rho^{A_2\cdots A_N}_{\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}}) = \sum_{i,j=0}^{D_1-1}\langle i|V_1^\dagger V_1|j\rangle_{A_1}\langle i|V_2^\dagger\otimes\cdots\otimes V_N^\dagger|\mu\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N} V_2\otimes\cdots\otimes V_N|j\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N} \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{D_1-1} C_j(V_2\otimes\cdots\otimes V_N|j\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N})$, and $R(\rho^{A_2\cdots A_N}_{\Phi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}}) = \sum_{j=0}^{D_1-1}\langle j|\omega\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}|j\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}$. Here, $|\mu\rangle$ and $|\omega\rangle$ are two arbitrary vectors in the $A_2\cdots A_N$ space, and we can write $|\omega\rangle = (\omega_0, \omega_1, ..., \omega_{d-1})^T, d = D_2 \times D_3 \times ... \times D_N$. We prove that there always exists a vector $|\omega\rangle$ which satisfies $C_j = \langle j|\omega\rangle, j = 0, 1, ..., D_1 - 1$, namely, $M_{D_1\times d}(\omega_0, \omega_1, ..., \omega_{d-1})^T = (C_0, C_1, ..., C_{D_1-1})^T$, where the coefficient matrix M consists of j's index entering the row. Notice that $\{|i\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}, i = 0, 1, ..., D_1 - 1\}$ are linearly independent, so $D_1 \leq d$. This implies the existence of $|\omega\rangle$. Since V_i's are invertible, the above discussion shows $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. Similarly we can get $S_2 \subseteq S_1(\Phi \leftrightarrow \Psi, V_i \leftrightarrow V_i^{-1})$.

Sufficiency. Suppose $|\Psi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ and $|\Phi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ have the same local rank. The above result for $S_2 \subseteq S_1$ can be more explicitly expressed as: if we write $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{D_1-1}|i\rangle_{A_1}\otimes|\varphi_i\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}$ and $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{D_1-1}|i\rangle_{A_1}\otimes|\psi_i\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}$, then $V_2\otimes\cdots\otimes V_N|\varphi_j\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{D_1-1}a_{ji}|\psi_i\rangle, j = 0, 1, ..., D_1 - 1$. This expression can be equivalently written as $V^{d\times d}|j\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{D_1-1}a_{ji}|i\rangle, j = 0, 1, ..., D_1 - 1$, where the $|i\rangle$'s are computational basis and $V^{d\times d}$ is invertible. So the matrix $M^{D_1\times D_1}$ is invertible where $M_{ij} = a_{ji}$. Thus, we have $\sum_{j=0}^{D_1-1}|j\rangle_{A_1}V_2\otimes\cdots\otimes V_N|\varphi_j\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N} = \sum_{j=0}^{D_1-1}M^T|j\rangle_{A_1}|\psi_j\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_N}$. By setting $V_1 = (M^T)^{-1}$, we arrive at the conclusion of the theorem. For the case of $S_1 \subseteq S_2$, the similar result can be proved. Q.E.D.

The above theorem gives a universal criterion of the equivalent classes of multiparty entanglement under SLOCC. It shows that one can judge whether two N-partite states are equivalent under SLOCC or not by analyzing the range of the reduced density operator of any $N - 1$ parties (the ranks are easily obtained). When two given states $|\Psi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ and $|\Phi\rangle_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ are investigated, we have to write out those local operations in detail, i.e., $V_i^{D_i\times D_i} = [a_{ijk}]$, the indices of parties, $i = 0, 1, ..., N - 1$, that of the matrix entries $j, k = 0, 1, ..., D_i - 1$, and they map one range to another. Obviously, whether the resulting entries a_{ijk}'s keep the nonsingularity of all V_i's determines whether the two states are equivalent under SLOCC or not. To simplify the calculation, one can determine the number of product states in the range of the adjoint reduced density matrix of each party. Such the number of product states can be accounted from the state expansions in the range basic vectors to satisfy the condition of product state. For example, consider the two stand forms of three-qubit states, $|GHZ\rangle_{ABC} = |000\rangle + |111\rangle$ and $|W\rangle_{ABC} = |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle$. One can readily write out $R(\rho^{AB}_{GHZ}) = \alpha_0|00\rangle + \alpha_1|11\rangle$, and $R(\rho^{AB}_W) = \beta_0|00\rangle + \beta_1(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$, $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_0, \beta_1 \in C$. Hence, no matter how the coefficients change, there are two product states $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ in $R(\rho^{AB}_{GHZ})$, and only one product state $|00\rangle$ in $R(\rho^{AB}_W)$, which has been used for the existence of different types of entanglement in three-qubit states [6]. The reason is, the states consisting of adjoint states are always different [11]. Since any product state can only be transformed into another product state under ILO's, we obtain a useful corollary as follows.

Corollary 1. If two pure states of a multipartite system are equivalent under SLOCC, the numbers of product states in the ranges of the adjoint reduced density matrices of each party of them must be equal.

The above corollary gives a necessary condition of equivalent classes of multiparty entanglement under SLOCC, and it is by employing this condition often more practical than the analysis of the whole range of given states, e.g., two states $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ are inequivalent under SLOCC, since we have known they have different numbers of product states in the ranges. However, the equality of the numbers of product states in the ranges of two states does not imply the equivalence of them under SLOCC. Once that the equality of the numbers of product states in the ranges is satisfied, one must check whether the states in the ranges can be transformed with each other under ILO's or not. If yes, such two states belong to an equivalent class under SLOCC. Otherwise, they are not equivalent under SLOCC. We introduce a notation $[a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_N]$ representing a set of states, and a state $|\Phi\rangle_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_N} \in [a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_N]$ iff the number of product states in $R(\rho_{\Phi_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_N}}^{A_1 \cdots A_{i-1} A_{i+1} \cdots A_N})$ is a_i, $i = 2, ..., N-1$. We will characterize the entanglement property of the state $|\Phi\rangle_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_N}$ mainly by this notation.

We examine the above depiction with a concrete example. Consider two states in the $2 \times 4 \times 4$ system, $|\phi_0\rangle_{ABC} = |000\rangle + |111\rangle + |022\rangle + |033\rangle$, and $|\phi_1\rangle_{ABC} = |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle + |022\rangle + |033\rangle$. Notice both of them possess symmetry under exchange of particle B and C, so we can write $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{AB}) = R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{AC}) = \alpha_0 |00\rangle + \alpha_1 |11\rangle + \alpha_2 |02\rangle + \alpha_3 |03\rangle$, and $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{BC}) = \beta_0(|00\rangle + |22\rangle + |33\rangle) + \beta_1 |11\rangle, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_0, \beta_1 \in C$. Let us move to find out the number of product states in all three ranges. one can readily see there are infinitely many product states in $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{AB})$ (also $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{AC})$), e.g., by supposing $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 0$ and then changing α_2 and α_3. On the other hand, supposing $\beta_0 = 0$ shows $|11\rangle$ is the unique product state in $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{BC})$. According to the above notation, we then write

$$|\phi_0\rangle_{ABC} = |000\rangle + |111\rangle + |022\rangle + |033\rangle \in [1, \infty, \infty].$$

In a similar way, we obtain

$$|\phi_1\rangle_{ABC} = |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle + |022\rangle + |033\rangle \in [1, \infty, \infty].$$

Clearly, the numbers of product states in each range of $|\phi_0\rangle$ and $|\phi_1\rangle$ are equal. For judging whether they are equivalent under SLOCC or not, we have to analyze the detailed structure of range of them. First, write out $R(\rho_{\phi_1}^{BC}) = \beta_0(|01\rangle + |10\rangle + |22\rangle + |33\rangle) + \beta_1 |00\rangle$, whose local rank of system B (or C) is 4 or 1. According to the range criterion, it must be mapped into $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{BC})$ by some ILO's. Because the local rank of system B (or C) in $R(\rho_{\phi_0}^{BC})$ is 3 or 1, there exist no ILO's making this transformation. $|\phi_0\rangle$ and $|\phi_1\rangle$ are thus inequivalent under SLOCC, although they have the same number of product states in each range.

Now, let us focus on the classification of entanglement in the $2 \times M \times N$ system. Although the structure of the whole space of pure states of this system $|\Psi\rangle_{2 \times M \times N}$ is very complicated, we can establish an interesting relation between $|\Psi\rangle_{2 \times M \times N}$ and some spaces of pure states with the local ranks lower than those of it. We shall use $\sim$ to denote the equivalence under SLOCC in this paper. There are two useful ILO's in the below discussion. They are defined by $O_1^A(|\phi\rangle, \alpha) : |\phi\rangle_A \rightarrow \alpha |\phi\rangle_A$ and $O_2^A(|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle) : |\phi\rangle_A \rightarrow |\phi\rangle_A + |\psi\rangle_A$, respectively.

Any state $|\Phi\rangle_{ABC}$, in the $2 \times M \times N$ space for $2 \leq M \leq N \leq 2M$, can be expanded as its adjoint form $|\Phi\rangle_{ABC} = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} |i\rangle_C$, where $\{|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, i = 0, ..., N-1\}$ are linearly independent and $\{|i\rangle_C, i = 0, ..., N-1\}$ are a set of computational basis. According to the conclusion of the lemma 10 in [12], we know that there is always at least one product state in $R(\rho_{\Phi_{ABC}}^{AB})$. Suppose $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} c_i |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$ is of product form, where the constants c_i's do not equal zero simultaneously. Let $c_k \neq 0, k \in [0, N-1]$. By performing the operations $O_1^C(|k\rangle, c_k) \otimes \prod_{i=0, i \neq k}^{N-1} O_2^C(|i\rangle, c_i |k\rangle)$, $|k\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |N-1\rangle_C$ and some ILO's making $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} c_i |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} \rightarrow |0, M-1\rangle_{AB}$, one can obtain $|\Phi\rangle_{ABC} \sim \sum_{i=0, i \neq k}^{N-1} |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} |i\rangle_C + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} c_i |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} |k\rangle_C \sim |0, M-1, N-1\rangle + \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} |\psi_i'\rangle_{AB} |i\rangle_C$. Thus $\{|\psi_i'\rangle_{AB}, i = 0, ..., N-2\}$ remains a set of linearly independent vectors. Let $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} |\psi_i'\rangle_{AB} |i\rangle_C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &= rank(\rho_{\Phi_{ABC}}^B) = rank(|M-1\rangle \langle M-1| + \rho_{\Psi_{ABC}}^B) \\ &\leq rank(|M-1\rangle \langle M-1|) + rank(\rho_{\Psi_{ABC}}^B), \end{aligned}$$

so $rank(\rho_{\Psi_{ABC}}^B) \geq M-1$. Based on the restriction of local ranks, we obtain a general equivalence relation such that $|\Phi\rangle_{ABC} \sim |0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi'\rangle_{ABC}$, $|\Psi'\rangle_{ABC}$ lies in $(|\Psi_0\rangle_{2 \times (M-1) \times (N-1)}, |\Psi_1\rangle_{2 \times M \times (N-1)})$ and $(|\Psi_2\rangle_{1 \times (M-1) \times (N-1)}, |\Psi_3\rangle_{1 \times M \times (N-1)})$. That is, any state $|\Psi\rangle_{2 \times M \times N}$ can be equivalently transformed into one of the four kinds of states by some ILO's. We are going to simplify this relation so that it is more efficient. Let $2 \leq M \leq N$, without loss of generality. If $M = N$, the ILO's make $|0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_2\rangle \sim |0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_3\rangle \sim |0, M-1, M-1\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{i=0}^{M-2} |ii\rangle \sim |1, M-1, M-1\rangle + (|000\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{i=1}^{M-2} |ii\rangle) \sim |0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_0\rangle$. So we only calculate $|0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_1\rangle$. If $M < N$, since $|0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_2\rangle$ leads to a class with lower rank and so does $|0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_3\rangle$ except the case $N-1 = M$, we do not consider them for true entangled states. The situation of $N-1 = M$ is fully similar to that of $N = M$ as above. Now, we arrive at the following conclusion.

Lemma 1. For the classification of true tripartite entangled states, there exists a general equivalence relation under SLOCC such that

$$|\Psi\rangle_{2 \times M \times N} \sim |0, M-1, N-1\rangle + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |\Psi_0\rangle_{2 \times (M-1) \times (N-1)}\,; \\ |\Psi_1\rangle_{2 \times M \times (N-1)}\,. \end{array} \right.$$

By extracting further the adjoint product state of the B party from $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and using of the above lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |0, M-1, N-1\rangle + |\Psi_1\rangle_{2 \times M \times (N-1)} &\sim |0, M-1, N-1\rangle \\ &+ |1, M-1\rangle |\chi\rangle + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |\Phi_0\rangle_{2 \times (M-1) \times (N-1)}\,; \\ |\Phi_1\rangle_{2 \times (M-1) \times (N-2)}\,, \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

where $|\chi\rangle \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} a_i |i\rangle$ and the arbitrary constants a_i's do not equal zero simultaneously. By combining the above result with the lemma, we can write out an united relation of equivalence.

Corollary 2. For the classification of true tripartite entangled states under SLOCC, the following equivalence relation is true,

$$|\Psi\rangle_{2\times M\times N} \sim \begin{cases} |\Omega_0\rangle \equiv (a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|M-1,N-1\rangle \\ +\,|\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M-1)\times(N-1)}\,, \\ |\Omega_1\rangle \equiv |0,M-1,N-1\rangle \\ +\,|1,M-1,N-2\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M-1)\times(N-2)}\,, \\ |\Omega_2\rangle \equiv |\Omega_0\rangle + |0,M-1\rangle\,|\chi\rangle\,, b\neq 0, \\ |\Omega_3\rangle \equiv |\Omega_0\rangle + |1,M-1\rangle\,|\chi\rangle\,, a\neq 0. \end{cases}$$

The condition $a \neq 0$ or $b \neq 0$ keeps $|\Omega_2\rangle$ and $|\Omega_3\rangle$ not becoming $|\Omega_0\rangle$.

Such equivalence relation shows that the lower rank classes of the entangled states can be used to generate the higher rank classes of the true entangled states for any $2\times M\times N$ system, called as "Low-to-High Rank Generating Mode" or LHRGM for short. So the corollary and the range criterion of the theorem 1 provide a systematic method to classify all kinds of true tripartite entangled states in the $2\times M\times N$ system.

First of all, we re-derive the result of true three qubit entanglements in the present formulation. For the $2\times2\times2$ system, from corollary 2, $|\Omega_0\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim (a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|11\rangle + |000\rangle$. It is transformed into $|111\rangle + |000\rangle$ by the ILO $O_2^A(|1\rangle\,, -ab^{-1}\,|0\rangle)$ for $b \neq 0$. Hence, $|\Omega_0\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim |GHZ\rangle$. By means of $|0\rangle_A \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_A$, one can easily see that $|\Omega_2\rangle \sim |\Omega_3\rangle$. So we only calculate $|\Omega_2\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim (a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|11\rangle + (c\,|0\rangle + d\,|1\rangle)\,|00\rangle + |010\rangle$. By performing the same ILO's on $|\Omega_0\rangle_{2\times2\times2}$, we can transform $|\Omega_2\rangle_{2\times2\times2}$ into $|111\rangle + (c'\,|0\rangle + d'\,|1\rangle)\,|00\rangle + |010\rangle$. If $c' \neq 0$, we find that $|\Omega_2\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim |GHZ\rangle$ by the ILO's O_2 acting on each party. On the other hand, if $c' = 0$, one readily gets $|\Omega_2\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim |W\rangle$ by $|0\rangle_A \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_A$ and $|0\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_B$. $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ are characterized as two states belonging to the classes $[2,2,2]$ and $[1,1,1]$, respectively. According to the range criterion of the theorem 1, they are two inequivalent states of true tripartite entanglement under SLOCC.

Now we turn to a more complicated system, the $2\times3\times3$ system. It can be easily seen from the corollary that all possible classes of true entanglement in this system can be written as the following forms

$|022\rangle + V_A \otimes V_B \otimes V_C\,|\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times2}\,,$
$|022\rangle + |120\rangle + V_A \otimes V_B \otimes V_C\,|\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times2}\,,$
$|022\rangle + |121\rangle + |000\rangle + |110\rangle\,,$

where V_A, V_B, V_C are 2×2 ILO's.

Based on the method of the LHRGM, we can use the lower rank entangled classes $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ to generate some entangled classes of the $2\times3\times3$ system. By using of the explicit forms of 2×2 ILO's, the above expressions can be equivalently written as

$$(a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|22\rangle + |000\rangle + |111\rangle\,, \qquad (I)$$
$$(a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|22\rangle + |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle\,, \qquad (II)$$
$$(a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|22\rangle + (c\,|0\rangle + d\,|1\rangle)\,|2\rangle\,(f\,|0\rangle + g\,|1\rangle) + |000\rangle + |111\rangle\,, \qquad (III)$$
$$(a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|22\rangle + (c\,|0\rangle + d\,|1\rangle)\,|2\rangle\,(f\,|0\rangle + g\,|1\rangle) + |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle\,, \qquad (IV)$$
$$|022\rangle + |121\rangle + |000\rangle + |110\rangle\,. \qquad (V)$$

Here, $(a,b), (c,d), (f,g)$ are arbitrary constants and two constants in each bracket cannot equal zero simultaneously. By classifying the expressions (I), $\cdots$, (V) into all possible entangled classes under ILO's, one can find out all inequivalent classes of true entanglement in the $2\times3\times3$ system. The result is following.

Theorem 2. There are six classes of true entangled states under SLOCC in the $2\times3\times3$ system as following

$|\Psi_1\rangle = |000\rangle + |111\rangle + (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)\,|22\rangle \in [0,3,3],$
$|\Psi_2\rangle = |010\rangle + |001\rangle + |112\rangle + |121\rangle \in [0,\infty,\infty],$
$|\Psi_3\rangle = |000\rangle + |111\rangle + |022\rangle \in [1,\infty,\infty],$
$|\Psi_4\rangle = |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle + |112\rangle + |121\rangle \in [0,1,1],$
$|\Psi_5\rangle = |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle + |022\rangle \in [1,\infty,\infty],$
$|\Psi_6\rangle = |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle + |122\rangle \in [0,2,2].$

Proof. According to the range criterion, we only have to judge state $|\Psi_3\rangle$ and $|\Psi_5\rangle$. We notice the product states are $|11\rangle$ in $R(\rho^{BC}_{\Psi_3})$ and $|00\rangle$ in $R(\rho^{BC}_{\Psi_5})$. This implies that if they are transformable, $|0\rangle^C_5$ must be transformed into $|1\rangle^C_3$. Because the adjoint state of $|0\rangle^C_5$ is $|01\rangle + |10\rangle$, and the adjoint state of $|1\rangle^C_3$ is $|11\rangle$, so there is no ILO between these two states.

Subsequently, we have to prove that the expressions (I), $\cdots$, (V) can be only and just transformed into the states in the theorem 2 by the ILO's. First we observe the expression (I). If $ab = 0$, by $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$ in all systems and $O_1^B(|2\rangle\,, \alpha)$ (α is regarded as the possible a^{-1}, b^{-1}, etc), it leads to the state $|\Psi_3\rangle$. On the other hand, if $ab \neq 0$, the operation $O_1^A(|1\rangle\,, \alpha^{-1}) \otimes O_1^B(|1\rangle\,, \alpha)$ makes the expression (I) into the state $|\Psi_1\rangle$. Second, the expression (II), if $b = 0$, becomes $|\Psi_5\rangle$. For $b \neq 0$, by means of $O_2^A(|1\rangle\,, \alpha\,|0\rangle) \otimes O_2^C(|1\rangle\,, -\alpha\,|0\rangle)$, we can transform (II) into the state $|\Psi_6\rangle$. The ILO's O_2 and O_1 acting on each party produce that the repression (IV) $\sim |122\rangle + |02\rangle\,(f'\,|0\rangle + g'\,|1\rangle) + |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle$ for $b \neq 0$ and $\sim |022\rangle + |121\rangle + |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle$ for $b = 0$. Furthermore, by the ILO's of O_2^C, $|0\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_B$, $|0\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_C$ for $b \neq 0$ and of $|1\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |2\rangle_B$, $|1\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |0\rangle_C$, $|1\rangle_A \leftrightarrow |0\rangle_A$ for $b = 0$, we establish the relation the repression (IV) $\sim |\Psi_6\rangle$ for $b \neq 0$ and $\sim |\Psi_4\rangle$ for $b = 0$. The expression (V) leads to state $|\Psi_2\rangle$ by $|0\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |2\rangle_B$ and $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |0\rangle$ in all parties. Finally, we have checked that the expression (III) is transformed into the expressions of (I) and (II) under some ILO's. Q.E.D.

In the $2\times M\times 2M$ system, since the dimension of the Hilbert space of the AB part is equal to that of the C part in the Schmidt decomposition, all pure states of this system are transformed into an unique equivalent class of true entanglement $|\Upsilon_0\rangle \equiv |0\rangle \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} |ii\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} |i, i+M\rangle \in [0,0,\infty]$ under the ILO's. By using of this result and the method of LHRGM, we can construct the equivalent classes of true entanglement in a general type of the $2\times M\times N$ system.

Theorem 3. There are two classes of states under SLOCC in any $2\times(M+1)\times(2M+1)$ system ($M \geq 1$),

$|\Upsilon_1\rangle \equiv |0,M,2M\rangle + |\Upsilon_0\rangle \in [0,1,\infty];$
$|\Upsilon_2\rangle \equiv |0,M,2M\rangle + |1,M,M-1\rangle + |\Upsilon_0\rangle \in [0,0,\infty].$

Proof. Following the LHRGM, from corollary 2, we can read out $|\Omega_0\rangle \sim (a\,|0\rangle + b\,|1\rangle)\,|M,2M\rangle + |\Upsilon_0\rangle$. If ab=0,

$|\Omega_0\rangle$ just is $|\Upsilon_1\rangle$. For the case of $ab \neq 0$, we perform the ILO $U_1 = O_2^A(|0\rangle, \alpha|1\rangle) \otimes \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} O_2^C(|i+M\rangle, -\alpha|i\rangle)$ on $|\Omega_0\rangle$ to be reduced to $|\Upsilon_1\rangle$. In the below proof, the invariance of $|\Upsilon_0\rangle$ under two ILO's is very useful. They are given by ILO **I**: $|0\rangle_A \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_A$, $|i\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |i+M\rangle_C$, $i = 0, ..., M-1$, and ILO **II**: $|i\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |j\rangle_B$, $|i\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |j\rangle_C$, $|i+M\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |j+M\rangle_C, i, j \in \{0, ..., M-1\}$. By the ILO **I**'s invariance of $|\Upsilon_0\rangle$, it is obvious that $|\Omega_2\rangle \sim |\Omega_3\rangle \sim (a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle)|M, 2M\rangle + |1, M\rangle|\chi\rangle + |\Upsilon_0\rangle$. By using the ILO's U_1, $U_2 = \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} O_2^B(|i\rangle, -a_i|M\rangle) \otimes O_2^C(|2M\rangle, \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} a_i|i\rangle)$, and the modified U_2 to act on $|\Omega_3\rangle$ sequently, we can transform $|\Omega_3\rangle$ into $|\Upsilon_2\rangle$ by means of the ILO **II**'s invariance of $|\Upsilon_0\rangle$.

Finally we determine the $|\Omega_1\rangle$'s family by induction. First of all, let us notice that $|\Omega_1\rangle_{2\times(M+2)\times(2M+3)} \sim |0, M+1, 2M+2\rangle + |1, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |\Upsilon_i\rangle_{2\times(M+1)\times(2M+1)}$ leads to the states $|\Upsilon_i\rangle_{2\times(M+2)\times(2M+3)}$, by both $|M+1\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |M\rangle_B$ and $|2M+2\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |2M\rangle_C$. This iterated relation implies that if there are only two classes in $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M+1)\times(2M+1)}$, $|\Omega_1\rangle_{2\times(M+2)\times(2M+3)}$ must enter into two classes of states in $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M+2)\times(2M+3)}$. For the case $M = 1$, the conclusion of [9] told us that indeed there exist only two classes of true entangled states in the $2 \times 2 \times 3$ system. Hence, there exist only two inequivalent classes of $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M+1)\times(2M+1)}$ under SLOCC, and $|\Omega_1\rangle$ must be classified into such two classes $|\Upsilon_1\rangle$ and $|\Upsilon_2\rangle$. Q.E.D.

Subsequently, we can use the entangled classes in the theorem 3 to generate those in another type of systems in the LHRGM way. The structure of the entangled classes in this type of system is different from that in theorem 3. We give them here.

Theorem 4. In any $2\times(M+2)\times(2M+2)$ system($M \geq 2$), there are six classes of true entangled states under SLOCC
$|\Theta_0\rangle \equiv |1, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |\Upsilon_1\rangle \in [0, 2, \infty]$;
$|\Theta_1\rangle \equiv |0, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |\Upsilon_1\rangle \in [0, \infty, \infty]$;
$|\Theta_2\rangle \equiv |1, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |\Upsilon_2\rangle \in [0, 1, \infty]$;
$|\Theta_3\rangle \equiv |0, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |1, M+1, 2M\rangle + |\Upsilon_1\rangle \in [0, 1, \infty]$;
$|\Theta_4\rangle \equiv |0, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |1, M+1, 0\rangle + |\Upsilon_2\rangle \in [0, 0, \infty]$;
$|\Theta_5\rangle \equiv |0, M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |1, M+1, 2M\rangle + |\Upsilon_2\rangle \in [0, 0, \infty]$.

Proof. According to corollary 2 and the rule of LHRGM, first, we write out the states to be dealt with
$|\Omega_0\rangle \sim (a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle)|M+1, 2M+1\rangle + |\Upsilon_j\rangle$,
$|\Omega_2\rangle \sim |\Omega_0\rangle + |0, M+1\rangle \sum_{i=0}^{2M} a_i|i\rangle$,
$|\Omega_3\rangle \sim |\Omega_0\rangle + |1, M+1\rangle \sum_{i=0}^{2M} a_i|i\rangle$,
where $j = 1, 2$. Now, we have to prove that the above states must be transformed into six kinds of states in the theorem 4 by some ILO's. These ILO's are composed of those similar to U_1, U_2 appeared in the proof of the theorem 3, and the ILO's of state exchanges in each party. By means of these ILO's, we have proven the following conclusions. For the case of generation in the direction of the class $|\Upsilon_1\rangle$, it can be easily proved that, by ILO's $\widetilde{U_1} = O_2^B(|M\rangle, -a_{2M}|M+1\rangle)$, and $|M+1\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |M\rangle_B, |2M+1\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |2M\rangle_C$, we have $|\Omega_2\rangle \sim |\Omega_0\rangle$. By ILO $\widetilde{U_2} = O_2^A(|1\rangle, \alpha|0\rangle) \otimes \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} O_2^C(|i\rangle, -\alpha|i+M\rangle)$, $|\Omega_0\rangle$ is transferred to $|\Theta_0\rangle$ for $b \neq 0$, and $|\Theta_1\rangle$ for $b = 0$ respectively. Meanwhile, by $\widetilde{U_3} = O_2^A(|1\rangle, \alpha|0\rangle) \otimes O_2^C(|2M+1\rangle, -\sum_{i=0}^{2M} a_i|i\rangle) \otimes O_2^B(|M\rangle, -\alpha|M+1\rangle)$, and $|M+1\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |M\rangle_B, |2M+1\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |2M\rangle_C$, we obtain $|\Omega_3\rangle \sim |\Omega_0\rangle$ for $b \neq 0$. For $b = 0$, $|\Omega_3\rangle \sim |\Omega_0\rangle$ if there is at least one non-vanishing $a_i, i = 0, 1, ..., M-1$, and $|\Omega_3\rangle \sim |\Theta_3\rangle$ if all a_i's equal zero, $i = 0, 1, ..., M-1$.

On the other hand, we consider the generation in the direction of the class $|\Upsilon_2\rangle$. It is useful that the invariance of $|\Upsilon_2\rangle$ under the ILO **III**: $|0\rangle_A \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_A, |M\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |M-1\rangle_B, |2M\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |2M-1\rangle_C$ and $|i\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |i+M\rangle_C, i = 0, ..., M-2$. By virtue of this invariance and the ILO's, we find that $|\Omega_0\rangle \sim |\Theta_2\rangle$. Furthermore, $|\Omega_2\rangle \sim |\Omega_3\rangle \sim |\Theta_4\rangle$ if there is at least one non-vanishing $a_i, i = 0, 1, ..., M-2$, and $|\Omega_2\rangle \sim |\Omega_3\rangle \sim |\Theta_5\rangle$ if all a_i's equal zero, $i = 0, 1, ..., M-2$.

Similarly, one can calculate $|\Omega_1\rangle$ by induction. By calculation of $|\Omega_0\rangle$, $|\Omega_2\rangle$ and $|\Omega_3\rangle$ above, the classes in $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times3\times4}$ are found such that
$|\Theta_0\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |123\rangle + |012\rangle + |000\rangle + |101\rangle$,
$|\Theta_1\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |023\rangle + |012\rangle + |000\rangle + |101\rangle$,
$|\Theta_2\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |123\rangle + |012\rangle + |110\rangle + |000\rangle + |101\rangle$,
$|\Theta_3\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |023\rangle + |122\rangle + |012\rangle + |000\rangle + |101\rangle$,
$|\Theta_5\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |023\rangle + |122\rangle + |012\rangle + |110\rangle + |000\rangle + |101\rangle$.
Notice that the class $|\Theta_4\rangle$ disappears here, for the coefficients $a_i, i = 0, ..., M-2$ always equal zero in the above derivation of $|\Theta_4\rangle$ and $|\Theta_5\rangle$. Then $|\Omega_1\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |023\rangle + |122\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times2}$. For the case of $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim |GHZ\rangle$, we have $|\Omega_1\rangle \sim |023\rangle + |122\rangle + |000\rangle + |111\rangle$. By $|3\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_C$ and $|2\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_B$, one obtains $|\Omega_1\rangle \sim |123\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times3} \sim |\Omega_0\rangle$. On the other hand, if $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times2} \sim |W\rangle$, then $|\Omega_1\rangle \sim |023\rangle + |122\rangle + |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle$. By the operations $|3\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |1\rangle_C$ and $|2\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |0\rangle_B$, we get $|\Omega_1\rangle \sim |001\rangle + |102\rangle + |023\rangle + |010\rangle + |120\rangle \sim |023\rangle + |120\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times2\times3} \sim |\Omega_3\rangle$. So there are five classes of entanglement in the $2 \times 3 \times 4$ system. Next, one should write out all classes in $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times4\times6}$, which is really the first step of the induction. Following the above technique we obtain $|\Theta_i\rangle_{2\times4\times6}, i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. Then we calculate $|\Omega_1\rangle_{2\times4\times6} \sim |035\rangle + |134\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times3\times4}$, where $|\Psi\rangle_{2\times3\times4} \sim |\Theta_i\rangle_{2\times3\times4}, i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5$. By $|5\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |3\rangle_C$ and $|3\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |2\rangle_B$, for the case of $|\Theta_i\rangle_{2\times3\times4}, i = 0, 1, 2$, $|\Omega_1\rangle \sim |135\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times3\times5} \sim |\Omega_0\rangle$; for the case of $|\Theta_i\rangle_{2\times3\times4}, i = 3, 5$, $|\Omega_1\rangle \sim |035\rangle + |132\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times3\times5} \sim |\Omega_3\rangle$. So there are six classes of entanglement in the $2 \times 4 \times 6$ system, i.e., $|\Theta_i\rangle_{2\times4\times6}, i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. Similar to the first step, one can continue with the deduction. That is, by $|2M+3\rangle_C \leftrightarrow |2M+1\rangle_C$ and $|M+2\rangle_B \leftrightarrow |M+1\rangle_B$, we always get $|\Omega_1\rangle_{2\times(M+3)\times(2M+4)} \sim |0, M+2, 2M+3\rangle + |1, M+2, 2M+2\rangle + |\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M+2)\times(2M+2)} \sim |\Omega_i\rangle, i = 0, 2, 3$. Thus, all classes of $|\Omega_1\rangle$ belong to $|\Theta_i\rangle, i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$.

Finally we should check that these classes of states in

$|\Psi\rangle_{2\times(M+2)\times(2M+2)}$ are inequivalent. According to the range criterion, we need only to discuss the relations between $|\Theta_2\rangle$ and $|\Theta_3\rangle$, and between $|\Theta_4\rangle$ and $|\Theta_5\rangle$. The proof of the former case is similar to that in theorem 2. Since the requirement of $|2M\rangle_{\Theta 3}^{C} \mapsto |2M+1\rangle_{\Theta 2}^{C}$ always leads to an entangled adjoint state of $|2M+1\rangle_{\Theta 2}^{C}$, $|\Theta_2\rangle$ and $|\Theta_3\rangle$ are inequivalent. The proof of the latter case is some difficult. We can prove it by the reduction to absurdity. First, we suppose that the AB system is in the adjoint state and there exist the possible ILO's V_A and V_B to make $|\Theta_4\rangle \mapsto |\Theta_5\rangle$. By theorem 1, $V_A \otimes V_B[R(\rho_{\Theta 4}^{AB})] \in R(\rho_{\Theta 5}^{AB})$. This relation produces a set of equations satisfied by the matrix elements of V_A and V_B. Carefully analyzing this set of equations, we have found that there exist only some singular solutions of V_A and V_B, i.e. $\mathrm{Det}[V_B] = 0$ or $\mathrm{Det}[V_A] = 0$. So there exists no ILO making $|\Theta_4\rangle$ and $|\Theta_5\rangle$ equivalent. We have detailedly proven this fact in the Appendix. Q.E.D.

To summarize, by using of the range criterion and the method of LHRGM developed by us here, we have finished the construction of true entangled classes of some types of the $2 \times M \times N$ system, which are with finite kinds of states. For the system with higher dimensions, one can also find out the classification by the techniques in this paper [13]. However, our method can be also applied to classify the entangled system with infinite kinds of states, which is also a puzzling issue in quantum information theory. Our results are helpful to classify and construct the inequivalent classes of entangled states in many-qubit system.

The work was partly supported by the NNSF of China Grant No.90503009 and 973 Program Grant No.2005CB724508.

APPENDIX: THE INEQUIVALENCE OF $|\Theta_4\rangle$ AND $|\Theta_5\rangle$

Suppose that the AB system is in the adjoint state and the possible ILO's are taken as

$$V_A^{2\times 2} = \begin{pmatrix} w & x \\ y & z \end{pmatrix}, V_B^{(M+2)\times(M+2)} = [a_{ij}], i, j = 0, ..., M+1.$$

Thus, these ILO's make $|\Theta_4\rangle \mapsto |\Theta_5\rangle$, if $\det[V_A]\det[V_B] \neq 0$ is satisfied. According to theorem 1, we must have

$$V_A \otimes V_B[R(\rho_{\Theta 4}^{AB})] \in R(\rho_{\Theta 5}^{AB}), \qquad (A1)$$

which yields that ($M > 2$)

$$V_A \otimes V_B[c'_0 |0, M\rangle + |0\rangle \sum_{i=1}^{M-2} c'_i |i\rangle + c'_{M-1} |0, M+1\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{i=M}^{2M-1} c'_i |i\rangle + c'_{2M}(|1, M+1\rangle + |0, 0\rangle) + c'_{2M+1}(|1, M\rangle + |0\rangle |M-1\rangle)] \in \sum_{i=0}^{M-2} c_i |0, i\rangle + c_{M-1} |0, M+1\rangle + \sum_{i=M}^{2M-1} c_i |1, i\rangle + c_{2M}(|1, M+1\rangle + |0, M\rangle) + c_{2M+1}(|1, M\rangle + |0, M-1\rangle),$$

the coefficients c'_i, c_i's, i=0,...,2M+1 are arbitrarily decided by theorem 1. Let only one c'_i be nonzero, e.g., $c'_{M-1} \neq 0$ and $c'_i = 0, i \neq M-1$. The above expression then implies

$$y a_{M+1,M+1} = w a_{M,M+1}, y a_{M,M+1} = w a_{M-1,M+1}. \qquad (A2)$$

Notice we have deserted the trivial results that can't bring those similar to the above relations between the entries of V_A and V_B without c_i's. We continue in the same vein, that is, to choose the uniquely nonzero c'_i in turn and obtain a sequence of relations such that

$$\begin{cases} y a_{M+1,i} = w a_{M,i}, i = 1, ..., M-2, M, M+1, \\ y a_{M,i} = w a_{M-1,i}, i = 1, ..., M-2, M, M+1, \\ z a_{M+1,i} = x a_{M,i}, i = 0, ..., M-1, \\ z a_{M,i} = x a_{M-1,i}, i = 0, ..., M-1, \\ z a_{M+1,M} + y a_{M+1,M-1} = x a_{M,M} + w a_{M,M-1}, \\ z a_{M,M} + y a_{M,M-1} = x a_{M-1,M} + w a_{M-1,M-1}. \end{cases} \qquad (A3)$$

If $wxyz \neq 0$, it must be that $a_{M-1,i} = a_{M,i} = a_{M+1,i} = 0, i = 1, ..., M-2$, since $wz \neq xy$. By substituting the former four expressions of (A3) into the last two expressions of it, on the other hand, one can get $a_{M,M}/y = a_{M,M-1}/z, a_{M,M}/w = a_{M,M-1}/x$. This implies that $a_{M,M} = a_{M,M-1} = 0$, which leads to $a_{M-1,i} = a_{M,i} = a_{M+1,i} = 0, i = 1, ..., M$. This conclusion is just $\det[V_B] = 0$. So there must be at least one equaling zero in $\{w, x, y, z\}$. If $x = 0, wz \neq 0$ (or $y = 0, wz \neq 0$,etc), it will lead to $a_{M,i} = a_{M+1,i} = 0, i = 0, ..., M$, again $\det[V_B] = 0$. So there is no ILO between $|\Theta_4\rangle$ and $|\Theta_5\rangle$. Similarly, for the case of $M = 2$, the same conclusion can be obtained. Q.E.D.

---

[1] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).

[2] M. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436 (1999); G. Vidal, *ibid.* **83**, 1046 (1999); G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).

[3] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012307 (2000).

[4] N. Linden and S. Popescu, *Fortsch. Phys.* **46**, 567 (1998).

[5] J. Kempe, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 910 (1999).

[6] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).

[7] D. M. Greenberger, M. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, *Bell's Theorem, Quantum theory and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Kluwer, 1989), p.69.

[8] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052112 (2002).

[9] A. Miyake, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012108 (2003).

[10] A. Miyake and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 012101 (2004).

[11] Otherwise it means $\sum_i a_i |i\rangle = k \sum_i b_i |i\rangle$, where k is a proportional constant. Because $\{|i\rangle\}$ are linearly independent, so the above equality requires $a_i = k b_i$.

[12] B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, S. Karnas, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062302 (2000).

[13] L. Chen *et al.* (unpublished).